DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 894 EA 011 655

AUTHOR Sullenger, Gary L.
TITLE Community Schools: Michigan's Program (State School Aid Act--Section 96).
INSTITUTION Michigan State Legislature, Lansing.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Analysis of Variance; Community Education; *Community Schools; Program Evaluation; School Superintendents; State Programs; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Michigan

ABSTRACT

School districts in Michigan wishing to implement community school programs have access to state grant moneys. Analysis of questionnaires sent to Michigan's school superintendents in 1977 revealed that those whose districts participated in the grant program supported more fully and their districts followed more closely the definition of the community school's role in community education set by the Michigan State Board of Education than did those whose districts received no grant aid. These findings were clear in four of five community types (city, town, urban fringe, and rural) and were inconclusive in the fifth type (metropolitan core city). The State Board definition for which support was assessed stated basically that community schools have a four-fold role: to make school facilities available for citizen use; to organize local residents for planning community education; to identify and utilize other available resources through coordination with local agencies; and to assist in initiating new or improved programs otherwise unavailable.
(Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the origiral document. *
****

Published By:
Senate Fiscal Agency
Senate Office Building
P.O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909

THE LEGISLATURE
STATE OF MICHIGAN
AT LANSING

SENATE FISCAL AGENCY

Post Office Box 30036, Lansing, Michigan 48909
Telephone: 517 373-2767

SENATOR JEROME T. HART
Chairman Appropriations Committee

SENATOR BILL S. HUFFMAN
SENATOR CHARLES O. ZOLLAR

EUGENE FARNUM
Director

November 13, 1978

TO: MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN SENATE

The attached study was conducted by the Senate Fiscal Agency in order to determine whether local school districts receiving state funds through section 96 of the State School Aid Act were addressing the roles of a community school as defined in the State Board of Education's position statement.

The study examines district superintendent's perceptions of implementation, and their attitudes towards the State Board of Education's position statement on community school programs.

Any estimates, unless otherwise cited, and conclusions are our own and were drawn from our analyses of the data, previous experience and research. They are the sole responsibility of the Senate Fiscal Agency and should not be attributed as a statement of intent from the Michigan Senate, its committees, or any of its members.

Any questions concerning contents of this report should be directed to us.

Copies of the document are available on a limited basis from our office in Lansing.

Sincerely,

Gary L. Sullenger

Gary L. Sullenger
Analyst
Senate Fiscal Agency

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: MICHIGAN'S PROGRAM
(State School Aid Act - section 96)

November, 1978

Prepared by:

Gary L. Sullenger, Senate Fiscal Agency

A report written expressly for the Michigan Senate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A

SUMMARY OF STUDY..... 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... 5

PART B

CHAPTER

I THE RESEARCH PROBLEM..... 7

Introduction..... 8

Need for the Study..... 10

Importance of the Study..... 11

II DESIGN OF THE STUDY..... 13

Introduction..... 14

Operational Definitions..... 14

Population..... 15

Development and Improvement of Instrument..... 16

Data Collection Procedures..... 16

Hypotheses..... 17

Treatment of Data..... 19

III SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 20

Introduction..... 21

Summary of the Problem and Procedures..... 21

Conclusions..... 23

Recommendations for Theorists and Practitioners..... 25

REFERENCES..... 25

APPENDIX

A. Letter Accompanying Questionnaire and Instrument..... 28

PART A

SUMMARY OF STUDY

During the Summer of 1977, the Senate Fiscal Agency undertook a study of the State funded Community School Grant Program (Sec. 96, State School Aid Act).

The purposes of this study were two-fold. First, to compare district superintendent's perceptions of local implementation of the State Board of Education (Board) position statement concerning: (1) the role of community schools in community school districts, and (2) the role of community schools in non-community school districts. Second, to compare district superintendent's attitudes relative to this Board position statement. In addition to State totals, comparisons were made between superintendents relative to implementation and attitude based on community types. These community types were defined by the Michigan Department of Education (1971) as: (1) Metropolitan Core City, (2) City, (3) Town, (4) Urban Fringe, and (5) Rural.

The information contained in this report is based on a survey of Michigan superintendents from both community school districts and noncommunity school districts. The survey instrument was pretested, revised, and refined for use in the study.

A Two-factor Statistical Analysis of Variance was used to determine differences in perceptions of implementation and attitudes toward the Board position

statement on community school programs.

Results of the study, indicate that:

(1) the Board's position statement on community school programs has been more broadly implemented in those school districts which have designated community school programs, and

(2) superintendents in community school districts are more supportive of the Board position statement than are superintendents of noncommunity schol districts.

Comments provided by district superintendents are summarized as follows:

Number of superintendents from community schools responding	Category of Response
25	Community school programs are good, however, finances become the greatest limiter.
2	We must be cautious about expecting schools to be all things to all people.
11	Programs for school aged citizens must receive priority over nonschool aged citizens.

Number of superintendents from noncommunity schools responding	Category of Responses
37	Community School programs are good, but when total funds are insufficient, the school district's priorities must be with the children.

12	District is too small to provide a community school program.
13	Schools must not be expected to be all things to all people.
11	Feel the district is doing it on its own without participating in the State program.

This study indicates that legislators who advocate: (1) greater utilization of existing facilities, (2) greater involvement of citizens in the identification of community needs and program planning, and (3) more coordination and cooperation of community agencies; could utilize districts offering community school programs as primary implementators of these roles, through the Board's position statement.

For district superintendents wishing to implement a community school program, this study found the Board's position statement could be used as a guide for development. Responses provided by district superintendents who had designated community school programs clearly indicated that program commitment consistent with the Board's policy statement was an integral part of the district's activities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is extended to members of the Michigan Senate. It was through their cooperation that the study was completed.

Michigan Department of Education whose assistance was most valuable.

Superintendents of local school districts throughout Michigan. For their assistance and time in the completion and return of the instrument.

Special acknowledgements are given to the following individuals and organizations for their contributions:

To Eugene B. Farnum, David Murphy and the Senate Fiscal Agency for providing the people, time and contingency support essential to the completion of this report.

To James Davenport, Uldis Smidchens and Leo Stine for their involvement in the refinements of the study.

To John Garber, Jack D. Minzey, Hugh Rohrer and Don Weaver for their advice and counsel in the revisement of the instrument.

To the State Board of Education for delineation of the policy statement relative to Michigan's community school programs.

Lansing, Michigan
November 13, 1978

PART B

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

The purposes of this study were to compare implementation and attitudes of superintendents toward a four-fold role of a community school in districts with community school programs with implementation and attitudes of superintendents toward a four-fold role of a community school in districts not having community school programs in the State of Michigan. The four role dimensions being: (1) make school facilities available for citizen use, (2) organize local residents to assess local conditions, help set priorities, and assist in program planning, (3) identify and utilize other resources through joint planning by local agencies, and (4) assist in initiating new and/or improved programs when they are not available through other agencies.

Michigan has had community schools since the early 1930's and has been part of the evolution from a summer program for school age children to the philosophical concept called Community Education which purports to permeate all of education. LeTarte and Minzey (1972, p. 11) in bringing clarity to the confusion stated that "the difference between Community Education and community school is that Community Education is the concept and community school is the delivery system for that concept".

Stark (1974), in addressing the need for cooperation highlighted that with the many services and agencies available in each community the need for coordination and cooperation was clearly evident. By utilizing the public school facilities to avoid any overlapping of services there would be a utilization of an agency which would be available throughout all communities and which had an adequate communication system with the community.

The terms community school and Community Education have been used interchangeably in the literature since the early 1930's. The interchangeable use of Community Education and community school has, and does cause much confusion, however, it has been attempted throughout this study to distinguish between the two. For purposes of this study Community Education is viewed as a philosophical concept that relies on the involvement of every institution, agency and organization in a community. When local school districts become involved in implementing the Community Education concept they are referred to as community schools.

The Michigan State Board of Education (hereafter referred to as the Board) on August 13, 1975 recognized in its document Position Paper on the Community School Within the Philosophical Concept of Community Education that Community Education and community school were different and to continue treating them the same would further the confusion. To distinguish between

the two, the Board defined Community Education as:

> A philosophical concept that recognizes the life experiences as being part of one's education and is not limited to formal instruction, certain age classifications or attainment of diplomas. Community Education further recognizes that a process of involving citizens in identifying the conditions, resources, and priorities of the community is the central means of improving one's opportunity in life. This process focuses upon every institution, agency, and organization of the community to deliver identified and prioritized services.

The Board further went on to define more narrowly a community school as:

> A school serving a grouping of residents in a community that makes its facilities available for citizen use; organizes the participation of citizens in assessing local conditions, setting of priorities and program planning; identifies and utilizes resources, facilitates joint planning by local agencies; and initiating new and/or improved programs . . . in an effort to improve the opportunity for all residents.

In this manner the Board recognized that Community Education as a concept was an appropriate responsibility of many organizations and agencies in a community; however, within the concept was a clearly defined role to which school districts attempting to be community schools should be addressed.

Need for the Study

Since the 1969-70 school year, state monies have been appropriated to local school districts for community school programs. Table I identifies monies which have been expended by school year.

TABLE I

Community School Appropriations

School Year	Appropriation
1969-70	$ 1,000,000
1970-71	$ 1,000,000
1971-72	vetoed
1972-73	$ 1,000,000
1973-74	$ 1,000,000
1974-75	$ 1,400,000
1975-76	$ 1,300,000
1976-77	$ 1,300,000
1977-78	$ 1,400,000
1978-79	$ 1,600,000

During the time prior to August 13, 1975, there was not a clearly defined role for school districts participating in the grant program. Rules which existed to provide direction for community school grants, stated that school districts could do anything except supplant regular instructional programs for students of school age. The result was that statewide community school programs varied from an adult education focus to solely recreation or enrichment. This lack of any type of uniformity had resulted in legislators, citizens and even persons in the field of Community Education having a great deal of difficulty explaining what the State's community school grant program was.

The fact that Michigan up until early 1975 had not adopted a State role for the community school resulted in numerous questions being raised by legislators, citizens, and persons in the field of Community Education, such as: "Are State funds sufficient to support the local community school programs?"; "Are community school programs just a duplication of services already available to the public?"; "Are community schools addressing anything that hasn't for years been the role of public schools?". These questions along with others have remained, even though during a eight year period $9,400,000 had been expended ($1,600,000 has been appropriated for 1978-79).

With the adoption in 1975 of the Position Paper on the Community School Within the Philosophical Concept of Community Education, there existed a State defined role for school districts participating in the grant program. However, during a review of research on Community Education and community schools in Michigan, there was not found a study which dealt with the implementation of the State adopted four-fold role by the State's school districts; nor whether any attitudinal differences regarding the role existed among the superintendents.

Importance of the Study

The birth of the community school program in Michigan occurred in the 1930's when one school district had utilized it's school buildings for summer programs. Although various other attempts were made during the ensuing years, few school districts in Michigan actually implemented community school programs.

The initial effort in community school programs was most accurately portrayed by Young and Quinn (1963) writing in the biography of Charles Stewart Mott of Flint. An investment by Mr. Mott which started out in 1936, of a few thousand dollars and involved only a few school buildings, has grown over the years to a multi-million dollar operation utilizing over 50 school buildings.

Seay and Crawford (1954), reported on an experimental project funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation which provided for community school programs in nine communities scattered throughout Michigan from 1945 through 1953.

In 1960, the Detroit Public Schools started community involvement through the Great Cities Improvement Project, funded by the federal government.

However, most of these attempts, except for Flint, were terminal in nature with specific objectives for which they were to deal.

Efforts to establish a State system of community school programs received serious consideration in the Michigan Legislature during the mid 1960's, however, it was not until 1969 that a State program was finally signed into law. During the first few years in which State funds were available for community school programs to school districts, there was little direction.

The role for the school districts which received these funds was not spelled out and as a result much variance in programs occurred throughout the State. The lack of role definition not only disturbed persons involved with the community schools, but in 1971 the Governor vetoed the State appropriation for the programs. During the following year, considerable effort was expended in the Legislature and in the executive office which resulted in the State appropriation being reinstituted for the 1972-73 school year.

Although 1971-72 was a difficult year for those trying to save the State community school effort, with the reinstatement of appropriations there was a recognized need for defined roles and expectations for those districts that would be participating in the State grant program. Many meetings occurred over the next few years between members of the Michigan Legislature, staff from the Michigan Department of Education, directors from the regional centers for community education, and representatives of local school districts throughout the State. After a great many attempts to establish roles for community schools that were realistic, meaningful and worthwhile the Board took action in August of 1975 to adopt a position paper on community schools in Michigan which identified the schools' role as:

1. make school facilities available for citizen use;

2. organize local residents to assess local conditions, help set priorities, and assist in program planning;

3. identify and utilize other resources through joint planning by local agencies; and

4. assist in initiating new and/or improved programs when they are not available through other agencies.

With the roles of the community school defined, there was then a need to study the local school districts of Michigan in order to determine if differences existed between community school districts and noncommunity school districts relative to the four roles.

The importance of this study could be noted by local school administrators who wish to improve their existing community school programs or those administrators who wish to establish a community school program. Members of the Board could find importance in this study as they try to determine the extent to which the four-fold role for community schools is being implemented by public school districts in Michigan. Members of the Michigan Legislature and executive office could realize the importance of this study as they must make decisions regarding allocation of State funds as the study reveals which programs are most clearly addressing State adopted roles.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purposes of this study were two-fold. First, to compare the implementation of the Board adopted role of a community school in community school districts, with the implementation of the Board adopted role of a community school in noncommunity school districts, according to superintendents in the State of Michigan. Second, to compare the attitudes of superintendents in community school districts relative to the Board adopted role of a community school, with the attitudes of superintendents in noncommunity school districts relative to the Board adopted role of a community school, in the State of Michigan. In addition to State totals, comparisons were made between superintendents relative to implementation and attitude based on community types. These community types were defined by the Michigan Department of Education (1971) as: (1) Metropolitan Core City, (2) City, (3) Town, (4) Urban Fringe, and (5) Rural.

To study a program that is based upon a theory, a form of "theory based" evaluation was selected. Alkin (1975, p. 11), defined this type of evaluation as:

> Where a program is designed to implement a model, a theory, or a philosophy, the evaluator must select his variables in conformity with that model, theory, or philosophy. He may or may not measure the outcomes predicted by the theory.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions were used in this study:

Attitude - questions 13-24 were developed to measure on a four point Likert scale the attitudes of the superintendent towards each of the four roles that were adopted by the Board.

City - a list of school districts classified as City, was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office.

Community school districts - a list of school districts in Michigan that were included in applications to participate in the 1976-77 community school grant was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Adult and Continuing Education Service Area office.

Implementation - questions 1 through 12 were developed to determine whether or not each of the roles adopted by the Board have been implemented in a school district, according to the superintendents.

Metropolitan Core City - a list of school districts classified as Metropolitan Core City was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office.

Noncommunity school districts - a list of all school districts in Michigan was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Department Services office. By comparing this list with the list of community school districts it was possible to identify the non-community school districts.

Superintendent - chief school administrator in a public school district in the State of Michigan. Addresses were identified through the Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide, 1976-77.

Rural - a list of school districts classified as Rural was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office.

Town - a list of school districts classified as Town was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office.

Urban Fringe - a list of school districts classified as Urban Fringe was secured from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office.

The lists of school districts classified as City, Metropolitan Core City, Rural, Town, or Urban Fringe were developed in 1971 by the Michigan Department of Education, Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Area office based on census data and the most recent address of each school district.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the superintendents of the 581 public school districts in the State of Michigan, as of July 1, 1976. Within the 581 public school districts, based on applications submitted by local districts to the Michigan Department of Education to participate in the State community school grant program, 282 districts were identified as community school districts. The 299 balance of the districts were identified as noncommunity school districts.

It was decided that for this study the participation of a school district

in the State community school grant program would be the determining factor for the school district being classified as a community school district. This decision was made because prior to this study no clear role definition for classifying school districts as community school districts had been utilized within the State of Michigan. Numerous groups or individuals had made attempts at the identification of community school districts; however, quite often, they could find few districts with which there could be agreement.

Development and Improvement of Instruments

In the review of the literature, it was determined that no research had been conducted to test the role adopted by the Board for a community school. The instrument utilized to obtain data for this study had to be developed. In the development of the instrument, it was decided that statements relating to implementation of the Board adopted role would require the respondent to react with either a yes or a no dependent upon implementation within the district. The scale was: yes = 2; and no = 1.

The statements relating to attitude of the superintendent toward the role would require the respondent to react on a Likert type 4-point scale. The scale was: strongly agree = 4; agree = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1. The absence of a "no opinion" option was decided upon in order to force respondents to make the choices which most nearly represented their attitudes.

Review of the instrument was accomplished through staff at Western Michigan University, and experts in the field of Community Education. These experts were directors of Centers for Community Education; and staff from the Michigan Department of Education, Research Assessment and Evaluation Service Area responsible for evaluation of the community school program.

Clarification in the content of a number of the questions including structure and organization was accomplished as a result of the input of these individuals.

A copy of the instrument resulting from the input and used in this study is in Appendix A.

Data Collection Procedure

The decision to use the mail questionnaire was made because the time and expense involved to conduct a personal or telephone interview with superintendents of school districts throughout Michigan was prohibitive.

In order to provide a check of the accuracy of responses made by superintendents, it was decided that a team from State government that had broad knowledge of school districts in Michigan would be asked to respond to questions 1-12 for a randomly selected 15% of the school districts in the State. It was determined that persons from State government would have broad based knowledge of the districts, with no stake in the outcome. The decision not to have this team respond to questions 13-24 was made because of the difficulty in knowing a superintendent's attitude.

Preaddressed stamped return envelopes were mailed with the cover letter and instrument to further encourage a large return. Each instrument had the code of the public school district to which it was being mailed in order that records could be kept on those districts that responded to the initial mailing.

In anticipation of an inadequate response rate, it was decided a return of less than 70 percent would be followed up with telephone calls as a reminder to the nonrespondents.

Hypotheses

In order to compare the implementation of the Board adopted role of a community school in community school districts with noncommunity school districts and to compare the attitudes of superintendents in community school districts towards the role with attitudes of superintendents in noncommunity school districts, the following research hypotheses were tested:

1. Superintendents of the total Michigan community school districts do report a greater implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of the total Michigan noncommunity school districts.

2. Superintendents of Metropolitan Core City community school districts do report greater implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of Metropolitan Core City noncommunity school districts.

3. Superintendents of City community school districts do report greater implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of City noncommunity school districts.

4. Superintendents of Town community school districts do report greater

implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of Town noncommunity school districts.

5. Superintendents of Urban Fringe community school districts do report greater implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of Urban Fringe noncommunity school districts.

6. Superintendents of Rural community school districts do report greater implementation of the four-fold role of a community school within their school districts than do superintendents of Rural noncommunity school districts.

7. The attitudes of superintendents of the total Michigan community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents from the total Michigan noncommunity school districts.

8. The attitudes of superintendents of Metropolitan Core City community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents from Metropolitan Core City noncommunity school districts.

9. The attitudes of superintendents of City community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents from City noncommunity school districts.

10. The attitudes of superintendents of Town community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents from Town noncommunity school districts.

11. The attitudes of superintendents of Urban Fringe community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents of Urban Fringe noncommunity school districts.

12. The attitudes of superintendents of Rural community school districts are more favorable towards the four-fold role of the community school than are the attitudes of superintendents from Rural noncommunity school districts.

Treatment of Data

Once the data were collected by the procedure previously described in this chapter, hypotheses one and seven were analyzed with the Two-factor Unequal N Analysis of Variance Test (Winer, 1962) to determine if a difference existed between community school districts and noncommunity school districts and by category, relative to the role which was adopted by the Board. The two variables were community school/noncommunity school and category of district. Hypotheses two through six and eight through twelve were analyzed with the One-factor Unequal N Analysis of Variance Test (Winer, 1962) to determine if a difference existed within each category between community school districts and noncommunity school districts relative to the role.

These tests were used because conditions of the F (F is the ratio computed in calculating the One and Two-way Unequal N Analysis of Variance tests) test were assumed to be met, including; independence of observations, a normally distributed population, a population with the same variance, measurement was on the interval scale, and the effects were additive.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the study of Michigan school districts relative to implementation and the attitudes of the superintendents towards the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school. The chapter is organized as follows: first, a review of the problem and procedures used in the study of the superintendents are discussed; second, conclusions drawn from the research study results regarding implementation and attitudes of superintendents towards the Board adopted role of a community school are covered; third, recommendations for theorists, practitioners and others with an interest in the role of the community school in Community Education are presented.

Summary of the Problem and Procedures

The purposes of this study were two-fold. First, to compare the implementation of the adopted role of a community school in community school districts, with the implementation of the adopted role of a community school in noncommunity school districts, according to superintendents in the State of Michigan. Second, to compare the attitudes of superintendents in community school districts relative to the adopted role of a community school, with the attitudes of superintendents in noncommunity school districts relative to the adopted role of a community school, in the State of Michigan. In addition to State totals, comparisons were made between superintendents relative to implementation and attitudes based on community types. These community types were defined by the Michigan Department of Education (1971) as: (1) Metropolitan Core City, (2) City, (3) Town, (4) Urban Fringe, and (5) Rural.

Superintendents were selected for this study from Michigan local school districts, because Wing (1972) indicated that the success of the program was getting support from the top first. Tremper (1974), also found that the superintendent's attitudes were important to the community school program. Finally Manley (1976), found superintendents in community education districts had attitudes in support of the Community Education concept more often than did superintendents in school districts without Community Education.

In order to pursue this study, it was necessary to develop the instrument from which the results were derived. The instrument consisted of 24 questions; the first 12 questions related to implementation in the district of the Board

adopted role of a community school and the second 12 questions related to the superintendents attitudes regarding the Board adopted role of a community school. The four-fold roles consists of: (1) making facilities available for citizen use, (2) organizing local residents to assess local conditions, set priorities and identify program planning, (3) identifying and utilizing resources, facilitated through joint planning by local agencies, and (4) assisting in the initiating of new and/or improved programs.

A listing of school districts participating in the 1976-77 community school grant program was secured from the Michigan Department of Education in order that community school districts could be identified. The balance of the school districts in the State were defined as noncommunity school districts. Of the 581 school districts in the State, 282 were identified as community school districts and 299 were identified as noncommunity school districts.

With the districts classified, the instrument was mailed to each district superintendent. After the first mailing 501 superintendents had returned the instrument. This was a return of 86%. In examining the returned instruments, it was necessary to discard seven for purposes of this study. Of the instruments which were used in the study, 261 came from superintendents of community school districts for a return of 92.55%. Superintendents of noncommunity school districts returned 233 instruments for a return of 77.93%. The return from the two groups was higher than the original goal of 70%.

To determine if differences existed in implementation of the Board adopted role of a community school or in the attitudes of superintendents toward the Board adopted role of a community school between the two groups of superintendents, a Two-factor Unequal N Analysis of Variance was used for hypotheses one and seven; and a One-factor Unequal N Analysis of Variance was used for hypotheses two through six and eight through twelve. Comparisons were also made by community type. At the .01 level statistically significant differences were found to exist in the implementation of the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school between community school and noncommunity school districts in: (1) Total State, (2) City, (3) Town, (4) Urban Fringe, and (5) Rural. Statistically significant differences did not exist at the .01 or .05 levels relative to implementation of the Board adopted role of a community school between Metropolitan Core City districts. At the .01 level statistically significant differences were found to exist in the attitudes of superintendents towards the Board adopted role of a community school between community school and noncommunity school districts in: (1) Total State, and (2) Rural. A significant difference was found at the .05 level in Urban Fringe communities. Statistically significant differences did not exist at the .01 or .05 levels relative to the attitudes of superintendents towards the role of a community school between Metropolitan Core City, City, or Town districts.

Conclusions

This study was undertaken to determine if differences existed between community school districts and noncommunity school districts relative to the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school in regard to implementation within the districts and if differences existed in the attitudes of the superintendents toward the four-fold role.

Authors, beginning with Everett (1938) and Clapp (1939) have indicated that the local school has importance to the total community that extends beyond the three R's for school aged children. Beginning with the use of the school buildings for recreational purposes from the early 1930's into the 1950's, a concept called Community Education has grown. Weaver (1972), stated that Community Education was community based, oriented, and committed to coordination for the betterment of all. The important role that the community school can play in the concept of Community Education was accentuated when the federal government (1974) referred to the school as the prime educational institution of a community.

Dowdy (1975) indicated the success of an education program would be nowhere without the support of the superintendent. Manley (1976) found school districts characterized as supporting the Community Education concept also had superintendents whose attitudes toward the Community Education concept were more in agreement, than were the attitudes of superintendents in districts not having a program in support of the Community Education concept.

In this particular study, school districts classified as community school districts in Total State, City, Town, Urban Fringe and Rural were found to have a greater degree of implementation of the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school than did school districts classified as non-community school districts. This could indicate that school districts in Michigan participating in the community school grant program were implementing to a greater degree the Board adopted role of a community school than were school districts not participating in the community school grant program. It would therefore appear that participation in the grant program results in school districts, to a greater degree, making facilities available for citizen use; involving citizens in assessing local conditions, setting priorities, and program planning; identifying and utilizing other community resources; and assisting in the initiating of new and/or improved programs. The lack of significance of Metropolitan Core City districts could be partially due to the low percent of response to the instrument by superintendents of non-community school districts or, perhaps circumstances related to the size of the districts which permitted them to implement some or all of the four-fold role without choosing to participate in the community school grant program.

This study also found that the attitudes of superintendents of community school districts in Total State, Urban Fringe and Rural were more favorable towards

the four-fold role of a community school than were the attitudes of non-community school district superintendents. This finding was consistent with Tremper (1974) who found superintendents with positive attitudes toward community involvement were in those districts with more successful programs. The results of this study were also consistent with Manley (1976), who found superintendents of community education programs were more in agreement with the overall Community Education philosophy than were superintendents of districts without community education programs. The lack of significance in attitudes of Metropolitan Core City, City, and Town superintendents could be partially related to the complexities of heading the larger school districts which could prevent superintendents from thinking about much more than their day-to-day operations in the district.

In summary, it can be concluded that the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school was being implemented to a greater degree in Total State, City, Town, Urban Fringe and Rural districts participating in the community school grant program than districts which were not participating in the community school grant program. Further, the attitudes of superintendents of Total State, Urban Fringe, and Rural districts participating in the community school grant program were more favorable toward the four-fold role of a community school than were the attitudes of superintendents of districts not participating in the community school grant program.

Recommendations for Theorists and Practitioners

Determining why some of Michigan's local school districts have implemented the role of a community school as adopted by the State Board of Education in August of 1975, can only partially be explained by the monetary incentive of the community school grant program. More importantly, the leadership provided by the superintendent must be considered a critical factor in the implementation of the role.

From this study one could conclude that school districts wishing to implement a community school program could use the four-fold role adopted by the Board as a guide for development. Legislators who advocate greater utilization of existing facilities, greater involvement of citizens in the identification of community needs and program planning, and more coordination and cooperation of community agencies could look to the community schools as primary implementors of the Board adopted four-fold role. Members of the Board can take pride in knowing that the Board adopted four-fold role of a community school was being implemented to a greater degree in community school districts than in noncommunity school districts.

REFERENCES

Alkin, Marvin C., and Fitz, Carol T. Methods and Theories and Evaluating programs. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 1975, 8, 3, 2-15.

Clapp, E. R. Community Schools in Action. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.

Dowdy, Homer E. The Past, Present and Future of Community Education. Community Education Journal. 1975, V, 17-21.

Everett, S. (Ed.) The Community School. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

LeTarte, Clyde E., and Minzey, Jack D. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

Manley, Frank J. III A Study of the Acceptance of the Community Education Philosophy by Superintendents in the State of Michigan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Western Michigan University, 1976.

Seay, Maurice F., and Crawford, Ferris N. The Community School and Community Self-Improvement. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Public Instruction, 1954.

Stark, Stephen L. Community Education - Coordination and Cooperation. Leisure Today. April 1974, 10.

Tremper, Paul A Comparison of Characteristics of School Districts Considered to Have More Successful Community Education Programs with Those Considered to Have Less Successful Community Education Programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Western Michigan University, 1974.

_____ U.S. Congress Passes First Federal Legislation to Support Community Education - Full Text on Community School Legislation. Community Education Journal. 1974, IV 5-6.

Weaver, Donald C. "The Emerging Community Education Model". Flint, Michigan: National Community School Education Association, 1972.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wing, Sherman An Enlarged Concept of Community Education. Community Education Journal. 1972, II, 27-28.

Young, Clarence H., and Quinn, William A. Foundation For Living. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

APPENDIX

THE LEGISLATURE
STATE OF MICHIGAN
AT LANSING

SENATE FISCAL AGENCY
Post Office Box 30036, Lansing, Michigan 48909
Telephone: 517 373-2767

SENATOR JEROME T. HART
Chairman Appropriations Committee
SENATOR BILL S. HUFFMAN
SENATOR CHARLES O. ZOLLAR
EUGENE FARNUM
Director

September 14, 1977

Dear Superintendent:

At its meeting of August 13, 1975, the State Board of Education adopted the document Position Paper on the Community School Within the Philosophical Concept of Community Education. The purpose of this position paper was to provide some guidance for districts participating in the State's Community School Grant Program.

In order that the comprehensiveness of this document can be tested, the attached questionnaire has been developed to collect information on the current status of various aspects of this position paper in local public school districts throughout the State. Research has shown that the direction a school district takes is influenced by those assumptions carried by the superintendent; for this reason we are requesting that you take approximately fifteen minutes to complete the attached "Questionnaire". Although your school code number is on the "Questionnaire", this is only done in order that we may check them off as they are returned; and later for comparison of districts by size. Neither you nor your school district will be identified by name in the final report. Please return by September 30, 1977 your completed "Questionnaire" in the attached pre-addressed stamped envelope.

Your cooperation in this study is most appreciated. If you have any additional questions, please write or call me.

Sincerely,

Gary L. Sullenger
Analyst

GLS:mjm

Enclosures

NOTE: IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL DISTRICTS COMPLETE AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE: WHETHER THEY PARTICIPATE IN THE STATE GRANT PROGRAM OR NOT.

-QUESTIONNAIRE-

Please check (✓) appropriate response for each statement.

1. Our school facilities are available for citizen use. ____ ____ yes no
2. Our Board of Education has adopted a statement encouraging the use of school facilities by all residents of the community. ____ ____ yes no
3. Our school district has a set of policies for the use of school facilities by community residents. ____ ____ yes no
4. Our school district utilizes citizen advisory groups in addition to the Board of Education, to assess conditions of the community. ____ ____ yes no
5. Our school district utilizes citizen advisory groups in addition to the Board of Education to set priorities. ____ ____ yes no
6. Our school district utilizes citizen advisory groups in addition to the Board of Education, to assist with program planning. ____ ____ yes no
7. Our school district identified physical and human resources in the community, other than those of the school. ____ ____ yes no
8. Our school district encourages joint planning by local agencies in community activities. ____ ____ yes no
9. Our school district encourages the utilization of all community resources in addressing community programs. ____ ____ yes no
10. Our school district is involved in the initiation of programs for all residents of the community. ____ ____ yes no
11. Our school district is concerned with helping to improve programs for all residents of the community. ____ ____ yes no
12. Our school district provides programs for community residents which other community agencies are unable to provide. ____ ____ yes no
13. Additional information, activities, and experiences should be provided to citizens by expanding program offerings before school, after school, weekends and summers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

14. Community residents have many education needs which should be addressed through the schools.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

15. There are times during the day, evening and summer when school facilities should be made available for general citizen usage at minimal cost.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

16. Citizens should participate in decisions that affect the quality of life in their community.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

17. Citizens should be encouraged to become involved in decision making and problem solving.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

18. The school should help identify problems and resources, and provide the coordination necessary to bring community resources to bear on problems.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

19. All community resources should cooperatively plan their activities which may interrelate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

20. The school should play a role in the delivery of community services.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

21. Efficiency in providing community services is improved when community agencies work together.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

22. The school should provide educational programs for all age citizens.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

23. The school should provide for the ever increasing need for additional activities for all citizens.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

24. Education interests and needs of non-school age citizens should be recognized as being as important as those of the school age citizens.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree